

approval. The Executive Board said "No, the Legislature approves it, not us". As a member of the Executive Board I got together with the union and with the Department, and we've set out a synopsis of that contract so that we could present that synopsis along with the contract to each member of this Legislature so that you would know what was in that contract. We should do no less, at this time. We should not approve a resolution, approving a contract by reference that not a single member of this Legislature has seen. We have the precedent set. Let's continue to follow that. Do not approve this resolution until the Labor and Business Committee has properly performed their function.

PRESIDENT: Senator Schmit.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Mr. President, members of the Legislature. I believe that Senator Maresh will speak on this. I agree with...I've been visiting with him privately. Of course, the Committee is very willing to provide this information to the Legislature. As Senator Kelly has pointed out, I'm sure, it's only right that we would have this information before we make a decision. It would be ridiculous for us to approve a contract which we had not seen, which we had only a synopsis of, and which of course the entire Legislature must take responsibility for. I think the Labor Committee has done a good job of putting together this information for us. Since this is somewhat of a new area, and we have not really tread very deeply in this area before, I would defer to Senator Maresh who would address it in greater detail.

PRESIDENT: Senator Newell.

SENATOR NEWELL: Mr. President, members of the Legislature. I would like to take an opportunity here to discuss a little bit about what the contract is, and why this Legislature is asked to approve the contract, etc. First, just let me say that the Legislature is asked to approve this contract that was negotiated between labor and management, between the Executive Branch negotiating team which was set out by Governor Exon, which had multi members, and negotiated this contract over a three year period. It's a very long and hard work contract. Basically, the reason that this contract is before the Legislature for ratification is because the Legislature wrote the law that way. Now in other states of the Union this would not necessarily have to be before the Legislature. It would be between labor and management. Then, that management being the Governors' negotiating team or the Governors' office, would then have to, if there was any fiscal impact, would then have to put that fiscal impact into the budget message which would go through the proper appropriations measures, etc. This contract, however, does not have any changes. It is basically an agreement as to the relationship between labor and management within the Labor Department. This contract does not set salaries different from what the Appropriations Committee sets for all public employees in the state. Consequently, the need is not there. I agree with Senator Murphy that the Legislature really ought not be asked to sign this. The only reason they are asked to sign this, or to ratify it on this floor is because that is the way the law provides. Basically, that check is there in case of any other fiscal impacts that the Legislature needs to protect itself from. In this situation there are not any funds, etc. that are required because there are no changes in the wage provision.